

## Appendix J

### SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

This report provides a summary of the public comments of the August 18, 2010 Public Information Meeting (PIM) for the Analysis of Potential Municipal Acquisition of the Ellington Airport. The summary includes the comments of attendees of the meeting as well as those submitted via:

- Comment forms submitted at the PIM
- Email to the Town of Ellington or CHA
- Correspondence mailed to the Town and/or CHA

Many of the comments received regarded the Town's obligations and responsibilities if the Airport was acquired and the airport noise analysis. Note that the economic and intangible benefits of the Airport were not studied in depth, as the main purpose of the Study was to determine the Town's ability to financially operate the Airport (under Town ownership). The study was presented as conservative with respect to the feasibility of future development and the growth potential due to several identified constraints discussed.

A general response to comments is provided below. Copies of the written comments received since the Public Information Meeting follow the comments and responses.

<b>Comment #1</b>	I am affected by the aircraft noise even though I do not reside within the 65dB DNL noise contour. Why did you average the noise?
<b>Response #1</b>	<p>Federal regulations require the use of the Day-Night <u>Average</u> Noise Level (DNL) to determine if aircraft noise impacts are "significant." It includes the noise of each repeated aircraft event throughout the day as well as the times when no activity is occurring. A location that experiences a noise level of 65 DNL may experience several daily events of over 90 dB Single-Event Noise Level (SEL), mixed with lower level aircraft noise events, and many periods without aircraft activity. DNL provides a single-measure that account for all of this activity.</p> <p>Although a DNL below 65 is considered compatible with all land uses, this threshold does not imply public acceptance. The number of people who are annoyed by aircraft noise in a specific area varies. Thus, there is no "universally acceptable" minimum DNL. Residential noise complaints are common in locations as low as DNL 55 dB. The Town would not be eligible for any federal or state assistance in providing noise mitigation to residents as all surrounding homes are located outside of the 65 DNL.</p>

<b>Comment #2</b>	Will the improvements of the Airport bring jet traffic? Additional noise is a concern.
<b>Response #2</b>	<p>No. Even with a runway extension to 3,200', the Airport will not be able to accommodate jets. It is expected that any additional aircraft will be of the same category as currently exists and would not increase the current noise levels a noticeable amount.</p> <p>The Town has not expressed a desire to change the type of aircraft operating at Ellington. It is unlikely a runway longer than 3,200 feet would be funded due to the proximity of Bradley International Airport and Hartford-Brainard, as those airports are equipped to handle larger aircraft.</p>

<b>Comment #3</b>	Is there a way to prevent the helicopters from flying over a certain area?
<b>Response #3</b>	The Town can work with the helicopter flight school to ask that they avoid certain areas, but they cannot truly restrict their activities. As there are residential homes surrounding the airport it would be difficult to determine which areas to avoid as it may mean additional activity for another area.

<b>Comment #4</b>	Why 2,500 feet for the runway length? Why 3,200 feet? Would it be any longer?
<b>Response #4</b>	<p>The FAA guidelines recommended a minimum length of 2,500 feet for the aircraft category that operate at Ellington (the smallest category). 3,200 feet is the FAA standard for establishing an Instrument Approach Procedure (IAP) which will allow pilots to utilize the Airport during inclement weather (e.g., low clouds). Neither the Town nor State wishes to improve the runway beyond this length.</p> <p>It is unlikely a runway longer than 3,200 feet would be funded by the FAA due to the proximity of Bradley International Airport and Hartford-Brainard Airport.</p>

<b>Comment #5</b>	Would additional land be needed for future improvements?
<b>Response #5</b>	The existing property is adequate for a runway up to 3,200 feet. Avigation easements would be necessary to prevent incompatible land use and obstructions beyond the runway ends within the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) as shown on the recommended plan.

<b>Comment #6</b>	Does all of the 125 acres need to be used by the airport?
<b>Response #6</b>	<p>No, surplus land may be released from the obligated airport property and sold for other airport compatible uses. The revenue from the sale of any airport property must be returned to the FAA if the property is sold.</p> <p>A second option would be to subdivide the land and acquire only the portion needed for aeronautical use. The current owner could then sell the remaining land for other uses.</p>

---

<b>Comment #7</b>	What are the risks of owning an airport of this size?
<b>Response #7</b>	The risks include the limited availability of the FAA funding, the uncertainty of hangar development, reduced general aviation activity, operator viability, and changes in operating costs. These risks are not uncommon for an airport, but they do need to be acknowledged and considered.

<b>Comment #8</b>	How often does the Town have to apply for grants for the projects? Will multiple projects be included on a single grant?
<b>Response #8</b>	Grants are usually processed by the FAA and State once or twice a year. A single grant may include only the design for a single project or cover multiple projects. The Town will submit an annual Capital Improvement Plan (ACIP) annually which ConnDOT and the FAA will utilize for scheduling future funding.

<b>Comment #9</b>	What if there is no funding for a project?
<b>Response #9</b>	The FAA and State works with Airports to provide the funding for critical projects, but the Airport is not guaranteed a grant for each project each year as listed in their ACIP. The Town is obligated to maintain safe operating conditions at the Airport even when funding is not available (i.e., repair major runway damages). The Town is not obligated to complete other projects such as construction of new taxiways without federal assistance.

<b>Comment #10</b>	There is an artificial constraint in place now restricting the potential for economic development as there is no stability regarding the longevity of the Airport. This results in companies being less likely to utilize the Airport. If the Airport were acquired publically, the economic development would not be as limited as suggested in the report.
<b>Response #10</b>	The private ownership of the airport may hinder economic development. However, it should be acknowledged that such potential development is also modest at public airports of this size.

<b>Comment #11</b>	The study compares the economic development of Ellington Airport to Bradley Airport, when many of the businesses that would want to come to Ellington would not want to go to a large airport such as Bradley. The market segment that Ellington would pursue is not addressed in the report. A runway extension would bring many of these types of businesses to Ellington.
<b>Response #11</b>	The report assumes that a major runway extension (beyond 3,200 feet) has limited feasibility at Ellington Airport, which would likely limit the potential for future business users.

---

<b>Comment #12</b>	What is the positive / negative cash flow of the current State-owned airports?
<b>Response #12</b>	While only one state-owned airport has a positive cash flow, all five state general aviation airports are significantly larger and have state personnel onsite. Compared to Ellington, the state airports provide more services and facilities than the typical municipal general aviation airport, as such; direct comparison of cash flow with Ellington Airport is not applicable.
<b>Comment #13</b>	What is the monetary effect of the acquisition on the local tax payer?
<b>Response #13</b>	If the Airport is purchased by the Town, the current tax revenue from the property would be lost. The financial analysis addresses this and identifies the impact in the financial evaluation. The financial scenarios include the outcome of property taxes and potential impact to the tax payer.
<b>Comment #14</b>	Will the existing buildings be owned by the Town or the current tenants?
<b>Response #14</b>	The study assumes that the Town will own the buildings and perform the maintenance and lease them to the tenants. Other options are feasible and may be addressed after discussions with the tenants at a later date.
<b>Comment #15</b>	What happens if one of the other local privately-owned airports closes?
<b>Response #15</b>	Simsbury, Skylark, and Ellington are all privately-owned airports, which are open to the public, that have been considered for acquisition by the local municipality. If one or two of these close the based aircraft will most likely move to one of the other airports. The future of these airports is intrinsically tied.
<b>Comment #16</b>	Would the Town have to operate the Airport 24/7?
<b>Response #16</b>	<p>The Town will not be able to restrict when, who, and where aircraft fly as they are obligated to keep the Airport open to the public, but they will not be required to staff the Airport 24/7.</p> <p>The lights are currently on a timer from dusk until 1AM. The study recommends pilot-controlled lighting so pilots may use the airport at night without having the lights on continuously.</p>
<b>Comment #17</b>	There have been many airports closed in the Northeast in the past few decades.
<b>Response #17</b>	Yes, several airports have closed, which is part of the reason the Town, State, and FAA have undertaken this study. They have an interest in preserving the existing transportation infrastructure as it is unlikely any future airports will be constructed.

<b>Comment #18</b>	The report says State ownership is unlikely, why is this so?
<b>Response #18</b>	The goal of the State is preservation of general aviation airports, but they stated they are not in a position to acquire any additional airports. While there is legislation in place that gives the state "first right of refusal" to purchase the Airport or its development rights, the State has not established funding to pursue acquisition of Ellington or any other Airport.

<b>Comment #19</b>	What would further study include?
<b>Response #19</b>	If the Town chooses to further investigate acquisition, a Phase II study can be completed, which would be tailored to the desires of the Town. This can include environmental testing, property appraisals, additional economic impact evaluation, the non-tangible benefits of the Airport, and additional financial analysis of scenarios.

**Written Comment #1****Affiliation: Town Resident**

Please accept this brief email as an indication of our lack of support concerning our town's consideration of the purchase of Ellington Airport.

We have reviewed the draft from Clough Harbor and Associates and believe it is a fair, balanced, and objective evaluation of the opportunities/risks the town would face in acquiring the Ellington Airport. As stated in chapter 6 - Recommendations and Implementation Plan : "...It is anticipated to result in essentially a break-even operation, but with a negative net balance once the tax levy is included...", the long term financial risk/loss to the town's revenue generation and potential damage to its' ability to address more critical capital needs in the future (ie. Crystal Lake School as an example) prevent us, as citizens of this town, from supporting the purchase of Ellington Airport.

There are certainly more financially beneficial uses of this land that should be considered in a separate study. If the Board of Selectmen so choose to consider further, in depth, study of the uses of this land, we are certainly supportive of this second study.

**Written Comment #2****Affiliation: Town Resident**

The town doesn't need to acquire this property. Keep it in the hands of private investors.

**Written Comment #3****Affiliation: Airport Tenant**

First, I would like to thank the representatives from CH&A for a relatively thorough and fair assessment of Ellington Airport from the town's perspective. You added a lot of insight that I am

sure most of the townspeople attending were not aware of. I learned a few things and appreciate the thoroughness of the study.

The big picture is that the FAA controls airspace, but not the land. FAA restrictions have increased incrementally over decades, and TSA requirements have significantly increased and complicated certain operations over the last few years. Becoming a pilot, owning and maintaining an aircraft and using it within the regulations is a real accomplishment. The numbers I heard are that in the lower 48, those with a pilot certificate number about 1 in 680. From my experience, these people are the type that I prefer to fraternize with. Most are homeowners, many are business owners, they are well educated, well informed, are can do type folks that are generally polite and respectful of others.

Finding a place to tie down an aircraft for a reasonable price within a sensible drive time is increasingly becoming a challenge. I grew up next to a grass strip in New York State of about the same length as Ellington Airport (the grass added a lot of rolling resistance when taking off). That strip has since been closed like so many others. AOPA estimated the USA has been losing airports at the rate of one a week for several years now with almost no new ones being built. Within a 50 mile radius of Ellington, there have been several airports of various sizes lost (remember Rentschler?). Most of them have succumbed to pressure from developers, or from splitting an inheritance. There are now no active airports in the Northwest corner of Connecticut. And there are fewer parcels of land left that are large enough to construct a runway. There should be more incentive to preserve the remaining functioning airports. The FAA has taken a very positive step in offering funds toward maintaining infrastructure, and the State is helping to chip in a small portion. Compared to maintaining the interstate and state highways, this program is a drop in the bucket. The same comparison can be made of the percentage of town commitment to maintaining an airport compared to the surface area of the town controlled roads and parking lots.

One item that the town should consider is a zoning rule to restrict additional residential building within close proximity of the airport. Just a few years ago, an entire development was built across the street (Rt. 83) from the main entrance driveway, right under the aircraft traffic pattern. Several years prior to that, an apartment complex was built just to the south of the runway. In my opinion, such building approvals were not well thought out for long range compatibility.

#### Usage

Having been a tenant of Ellington Airport for many years, I can weigh in on several of the items covered in the informational meeting. There are several distinct and separate entities at the airport, and I have listed them by activity and use (my perspective).

- 1) AA Budget Auto Repair - non aircraft related commercial tenant (6 days / week).
- 2) Northeast Helicopter - mostly training operations (7 days & evenings / week).
- 3) Ellington Skydive club - Recreational and training - Extended seasonal
- 4) Fixed wing pilots - Primarily recreational use with seasonal trend.
- 5) Sapoznik Aviation - FBO maintenance (5 days / week)
- 6) Dumpsters (next to Kocher) scrap metal recycling (3+ movements / week)

- 7) Brian Kocher Excavation - non aircraft related commercial tenant (2 days / week).
- 8) Farming of open land.
- 9) Other - Seasonal agricultural spraying & occasional banner towplane.

AA was placed higher on this list due to the year round full time nature of the business. Northeast Helicopter has more people but most are part time or independent.

There is one structure that was left out of Table 1-1. That is the landing tower for helicopter practice about mid-field up on the eastern ridge, (behind the building to the south of TSI Harley), although it could be rolled into the generic heading of "Helicopter School". It is essentially a deck on stilts.

#### Noise

I would like to see a real microphone based noise study. I believe the model used leaves much to be desired. Apparently, an assumption was made that the helicopters spend most of their hovering time at the ramp near the school. In fact, they use much of the entire airport for practice. The western grass all along the runway gets the most use, the northeastern corner of the taxiway has an area with a 5 degree slope that is used for landing practice, and the mid-field tower on the eastern side is used quite a bit. There are sometimes two or three hovering at a time for periods of up to 20 minutes near one spot. The helicopter traffic pattern runs opposite the fixed wing pattern.

Generally, neither of the (louder) jump planes fly at night. My perception is that the model inputs cause the computer to feed back an average noise level that is way above the high side of reality - GIGO.

#### Personal Considerations

By profession, I am an engineer in the aircraft industry, have a FAA Powerplant certificate and have a Masters in Financial Administration. I am also very fiscally conservative and do not wish to see any additional burdens placed upon either the town or the tenants of the airport. If done properly, my opinion is that a transfer of ownership could result in a short term break-even deal, and long term be rolled into existing town duties with the end result of total duties equivalent to a part time employee, plus an on-site part time manager that is supported by the tax and rental structure still at a break even status.

I find it odd that information for the analysis was gathered from "interviews with owners, operators and users of competitive airports to the Ellington Airport" (page 3-1) but not from the users of Ellington Airport itself. I have some experience from both sides of this analysis, but was never contacted about this issue prior to the public meeting. Over the 20 years I have owned my airplane, it has been based at Skylark (a listed competitor and closer to where I worked at the time), Westfield (to avoid prohibitive CT taxes at the time), Beverly, MA (while working a contract job) and Ellington (closest to where I live). I would not base at Brainard (a listed competitor and closer to where I work now) due to the fact it is well within the 100 year flood plain. You can research what happened when the Piper factory in Pennsylvania was flooded. I fly into all of the other listed competitors and others outside the listed range.

Yes, Ellington is a short strip, and take off weight must be factored when departing on a hot humid day. It is sometimes used by students from other airports for short field practice, a very valuable skill especially in an emergency. Ellington is not a destination airport as are many of the others in the area. Barring a new major public attraction in the Ellington area, or a big jump in training demand, I do not foresee a large increase in traffic at the airport.

The greatest short to medium term benefit that I can see to the Town of Ellington taking ownership is that stability of the operation will lower risks and improve the forecasting ability for planning purposes. Tenants are more likely to sign leases with a stable operation. For the long term, when the economy improves, demographics are in favor of slow but steady growth in aviation. If the runway length were extended to include instrument operations, there would be a few more business planes based at Ellington. They would require hanger space. The experience at nearby Skylark is that if you build hangers, they will fill up. Recycling hangers from other airports that are closing has been very cost effective there.

The purpose of the tube and tarp hanger is to protect my aircraft from a potential hail storm. A secondary benefit is that the strong mid-day sun is not deteriorating the paint as quickly. My overall intent was and is to keep the structure completely temporary. This intent negates some of the conclusions drawn in the recommendations section (page B-9). If necessary, it can be removed in one day by one person plus a helper for a couple of hours, and it would not leave any lasting footprint. Prior to my obtaining this structure, it was used as temporary protection for a fixed wing crop duster at a tie down space further south along the same row (no evidence remains of its footprint there). At that time there were no support piers. I added them at the current location to level the base. They are not necessary and could be removed if mandated. Every winter the frost heaves the blocks so they tend to pull apart from each other a little bit. The banding is very effective at holding each layer of blocks together (rusting metal bands could be replaced with fiberglass). This banding was not intended to hold separate layers to each other. Construction of a more substantial foundation such as solid piers would complicate a quick removal.

With the temporary intent in mind, I am willing to accept some maintenance. It took six years for the blocks to shift to the position they were in when they were photographed (a glacial pace), and for the plywood to deteriorate (images on pages 1-4, 6-1 and B-9). Since the public meeting, I have spent a half day restoring the piers to level and square and replaced the rotted plywood sections at virtually no cost (see attached images). About a month prior to the public meeting, I performed a repair to the fabric tears on the north side at a cost of about \$150 for materials. I estimate that in about 4- 5 years, the tarp will need to be replaced at a cost of about \$4,500, with labor provided by myself for 4 hours and a helper for about 2 hours. The new cover should last about 15-18 years (manufacturer claims 20 years), for an annualized maintenance cost of about \$300. One half day of labor every few years can eliminate the \$7,700 expense for Hanger # 3 that is listed in Appendix B.

*Written Comment #4*



***Affiliation: Town Commission Member*****The question is: Why is the town of Ellington looking to buy the airport?**

After having listened to the presentation on Wednesday and having reviewed the documents, I came to the following understanding:

- 1) The airport is for sale;
- 2) The airport is profitable as it is for the owner;
- 3) The town of Ellington receives \$45,000+ of 'Do-Nothing Income' from taxes annually (i.e., there is no need to maintain and manage the airport, no need to deal with FAA, DOT, etc.). With the current owner being profitable despite tough economy, the income may continue.
- 4) On the other hand, the town will need to spend \$170,000+, which is equal to 3.5 years of current airport property taxes, to bring the facilities up to shape. (The consultants did not have a projected profit and loss statement of operations under the town ownership. Therefore, I cannot comment on potential income (or loss) of this venture beyond stated cost and taxes);
- 5) Neither runway improvement nor its lengthening seem to significantly improve town's economy;
- 6) There are may be difficulty approving the purchase on the referendum if the town citizens become concern of noise levels, eminent domain/easement rights issues;
- 7) The idea of converting the airport into a residential area is subject to environmental cleanup (including asbestos and oil) and possible related stigma. The industrial/commercial use is only a bit better choice without any known businesses coming into the town;
- 8) The preservation and improvement of the airport may benefit the town as it enhances its appeal for some citizens. However, it could be done by another private owner, who upon purchasing shall be required by the town of Ellington to maintain it up to FAA's standards;
- 9) Last, but not least is the FAA rules: 'Assurance number 19. With or without the federal dollars, the airport must be maintained by the airport sponsor'.

I do recognize that there may be other benefits to Ellington, which I am not aware. So, what is the reason for *the* town to buy the airport?

***Written Comment #5******Affiliation: CT Parachutists, Inc***

Thanks for the information session and giving us the opportunity to comment. I'd just like to comment on Section 3.3 of the report, Airport Economic Impact. I believe that the estimates of direct and indirect economic impacts are low. As an example, in Table 3-6, CT Parachutists, Inc. is said to support 4 FTE jobs at gross wages of \$75,620. I am on the Connecticut Parachutists, Inc. Board of Directors and I'll share that our year-to-date gross wages are currently in excess of \$112,000. By year end, that figure will be much higher. While we have no actual full-time employees, we support well over the equivalent of 4 full time jobs. Connecticut Parachutists also puts a lot of money back into the local and regional economy.

The report also does not estimate the economic impact of the tourists and visitors Connecticut

Parachutists brings to the area. Every summer weekend, well over 100 people spend a day or weekend to skydive. These people buy gas and eat in the town or in the region. Local restaurants such as Casey's Cafe, Pastori's Restaurant, Holiday Pizza, and Hometown Pizza are visited weekly by skydivers. Many other local businesses are positively impacted by these visitors including package stores, grocery stores, etc. I believe that when these factors are taken into account, the indirect economic impact of the airport will include much more than the 17 jobs and \$661,400 in wages estimated in the report.

If you have any questions about Connecticut Parachutists, Inc, the airport's 2nd largest tenant, please let me know. I would like to ensure that Connecticut Parachutists remains an important part of the airport in any future development plans.

***Written Comment #6***

***Affiliation: Town Resident***

I was wondering if it makes sense to express the following to the taxpayers of Ellington.

The airport owners have every intention to sell the property no matter what; to the town, to a residential developer or a commercial developer. If the airport is sold as residential property the additional homes and families would put it's own stress and challenges on the already over crowded schools, over burdened fire department, police department and municipality. Eventually, this would result in higher cost to the town and the tax payers.

If the land was sold to a commercial developer I believe, along with other properties in Ellington that are up for sale for commercial use, would sit and wait indefinitely for a buyer and succumb to eventual decay and over grown property.

Purchasing the airport and allowing it to grow, I believe, is the best option available. Allowing it to grow, the airport would eventually become self sufficient and not a burden on the community, the town's infrastructure or the taxpayers of Ellington.

Just my 2 cents from an airplane owner, airport user and more importantly a resident and taxpayer of Ellington.

***Written Comment #7***

***Affiliation: Town Resident***

I thought your analysis of Ellington Airport was exceptional. The study details covered most issues a tax paying resident wants to be informed about. I think most people who attended the meeting and those who read your report need to know more about bonding. What is a bond and what are the financial implications to the town? It is not as simple as "the town would obtain bonding"....what is the responsibility of the tax payer? HOW MUCH \$ IS ASSOCIATED WITH THE BOND AND WHAT IS THE COST? Most of us are not familiar with the process.

Several years ago one flight pattern from Bradley International brought major air traffic over the Cider Mill Heights area where I live. In time the FAA made changes in this pattern to accommodate Ellington Airport traffic. At that time there were over a hundred students learning how to fly, skydivers and helicopters. I witnessed some strange sights in the sky over my home and I'm sure those of us on the ground never heard about the close calls. The FAA was not about to report those issues to the town. This is one powerful organization and the Town of Ellington needs to think twice before giving the FAA a 95% share of the town. It has been my experience that the primary role of the FAA is to promote aviation.....at any cost!!!

I have been annoyed by the noise from planes and helicopters for too many years and I'm tired of it. The noise level at times was so loud that I could not hear the person talking next to me and that was inside my home. Complaints to Ellington Airport fell on deaf ears. Like someone at the meeting said, I too do not think the noise evaluation was accurately reported. Using the FAA level of 65, supports FAA standards and we know what that means. What guideline supports the homeowner who also has rights? The FAA standard is unfair to the homeowner. We all moved here for "peace and quiet" and not constant noise.

***Written Comment #8***

***Affiliation: FAA***

It is critical that the message is conveyed to Ellington that if they acquire the airport:

- 1) They become responsible for improvements with or without federal funding
- 2) They accept all federal grant assurances
- 3) All of the revenue generated at the airport stays at the airport and does not revert to a municipal fund.
- 4) The State must recommend this airport as vital to their system of airports and be willing to use state apportionment dollars to assist with their projects.
- 5) FAA will not fund contaminated soil clean up and it must be done prior to FAA funding for acquisition

The report does not clearly explain the financial responsibilities that the Town owns in the likely event that maintenance needs to be done and FAA will not fund it.

***Written Comment #8***

***Affiliation: Town Resident***

I would like to offer some input on the town of Ellington purchasing airport property. The current owner reported a significant cost/price increase of aircraft fuel in recent years. There appears to be a substantial risk if fuel prices increase dramatically in the future. The scenarios presented in the report might be impacted by a decrease of recreational use, because fuel costs will discourage recreational flying.

Related to the above. There must be a limited pool of aircraft owners in the area under discussion, with little likelihood of that increasing. If the town purchased the airport, they would only be competing with other similar airports for a fixed pool of users.

The issue of noise would be a significant concern. There is a very active helicopter training facility at the airport. This facility promotes itself as able to operate seven days a week, anytime all day long. Their low-altitude maneuvers are concentrated in the area around the airport and often generate substantial noise.

Also, if the airport design was enhanced there would have to be consideration on the effect that would have on property values. It would be hard to imagine that there would not be an impact on the real estate value of homes in that part of the town.

Under the best of scenarios, the airport would be a burden to the town, with little or no gain to Ellington--financial or otherwise. If the town purchases the airport they are locked in with uncertainties and risks indefinitely, with no recourse to back out.

***Written Comment #9***

***Affiliation: Town Resident***

Thank you for conducting the informational meeting, it was very educational.

I don't think the town should purchase the airport. There are too many variables that will have to work just right in order for the property to be profitable. The town will be giving up taxable property. Even though the FAA will be absorbing the vast majority of the runway improvements, soil remediation (if required) will be the Town's responsibility.

Obviously, as shown in your report, the best option is for private development – housing being the most profitable. Right now the economy is down so immediate purchase & development probably won't happen – we have to take care of our schools, fire house, etc before we purchase a piece of property that may become a money pit.

***Written Comment #10***

***Affiliation: Town Resident***

Town needs airport – recreation business connection – housing development only raises taxes – always a negative.